



Oregon

John A. Kitzhaber, M.D., Governor

Department of Land Conservation and Development
Ocean and Coastal Services Division

635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150

Salem, Oregon 97301-2540

Phone: (503) 373-0050

Fax: (503) 378-6033

www.oregon.gov/LCD/OCMP

June 20, 2012

TO: TSPAC

FROM: Paul Klarin

CC: File

RE: TSPAC Fisheries Resources Subcommittee Meeting Report 6/8/12



The first meeting of the TSPAC Fisheries Resources Subcommittee was attended in person by committee members Bob Eder, Caren Braby, Terry Thompson, Rick Williams, Nick Furman, and Robin Hartmann. John Holloway, Linda Buell, Jack Holland and Bill O'Beirne (NOAA), attended via conference phone. A digital audio file of the meeting is available.

The meeting focused primarily on three topics; how to assimilate new fisheries maps into the planning process, a review of the existing standards for regulating the impacts to fishing areas in the Rhode Island SAMP and Massachusetts Ocean Plan, and a discussion about formulating customized regulatory standards that would be applied to the draft Oregon TSP zone types.

New fishing area map material:

The discussion began with a discussion of the new maps of crab fishing areas, and the group was assisted by Charles Steinback of Ecotrust, the contractor working with SOORC and FISHCRED. Ecotrust is producing maps for each sector, including charter and recreation, which will associate the economic values with the effort maps that have already been submitted. The new maps are currently in review by the fishing community and will be submitted to the state agencies after that review. The discussion focused on the use of those maps in applying a quantitative type of standard for determining the impact of a proposed development on a sector or port.

The discussion about the Pacific City Dorymens Association map related to the distinction between the methods that the association used to collect the data, and the methods used by all the other port groups, and what it represents in terms of economic value and volume of catch. There was also a discussion about the continuing need to address the lack of reliable data for distinguishing areas important to sport fishing coastwide, and how those important areas need to be represented despite the lack of economic data.

It was decided to put off any further discussion about the use of the maps to define areas important to fisheries until the new maps have been reviewed and submitted to the agencies for use, and the PC Dorymens Association has submitted additional information on data collection.

Review of other state plan examples:

The group then discussed how fisheries were regulated in the Rhode Island and Massachusetts plans. There was a discussion about the way those state's apply mitigation to projects, with the understanding that Oregon does not have any authority to require mitigation for ocean activities. The group also discussed the possibility of using the ODFW Fishermen Advisory Board as a resource in the state can apply when it makes a determination about the impact a development proposal might have on fishing areas, similar to what is being done in other states. The concept of placing areas that are important to fisheries in the exclusion area was discussed, based on the ability to define those areas using the significant economic data for areas. Some of the language used by RI and MA was called out as being useful to use in the drafting zone descriptions.

Consideration of customized alternative regulatory screening methods:

The group discussed how to use the economic fishing data that will be made available by the fishing communities to create screening criteria and a standard for determining if a proposed development would have an adverse impact. The discussion focused on how the process would work for developers considering a specific area, and possible interactions with the local fishing community, as well as others, in advance of submitting permit applications to the federal or state agencies. The group discussed the need to have different economic impact standards for sectors and ports, for each zone. The group also discussed the need to account for fishing conducted by a boat out of one port that is extracted from an area near a different port. It was acknowledged that the smaller ports generally don't account for much of the landings, as the larger boats bring the take back to the larger port processor facilities in the major ports.

The group briefly discussed planning in federal waters, and how the data would be used for any planning efforts that occur through a special area management plan that the state will pursue once the territorial sea plan process has concluded.

It was agreed that any standard would be quantitative, based on economic value, and qualitative to account for other factors. Some ideas about social impacts were discussed such as dislocation, constriction or exit from the fishery, as potential qualitative impacts that could be applied. It was suggested that FISHCRED do some hypothetical scenario exercises, using the economic maps, to determine what the level of impact might be on sectors and ports.